

**IOWA WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS BUREAU**

MICHELLE M FOGLE
Claimant

FBG SERVICE CORPORATION
Employer

APPEAL 21R-UI-03424-AW-T
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE
DECISION

OC: 07/19/20
Claimant: Appellant (1)

Iowa Code § 96.5(2)a – Discharge for Misconduct

STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

Claimant filed an appeal from the September 10, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision that denied benefits. The parties were properly notified of the hearing. A telephone hearing was scheduled for November 5, 2020. No hearing was held because appellant failed to respond to the hearing notice and provide a telephone number at which appellant could be reached for the scheduled hearing. On November 6, 2020, a default decision was issued dismissing the appeal.

On November 16, 2020, claimant appealed to the Employment Appeal Board (EAB). On January 19, 2021, the EAB remanded this matter to the Appeals Bureau for a hearing on the merits. Upon remand, due notice was issued and a hearing was held on March 29, 2021 at 10:00 a.m. Claimant participated. Employer participated through Thomas Kuiper, Hearing Representative, and Tajia Schwartzman, Human Resources Manager. No exhibits were admitted. Official notice was taken of the administrative record.

ISSUE:

Whether claimant's separation was a discharge for disqualifying job-related misconduct.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Having reviewed all of the evidence in the record, the administrative law judge finds: Claimant was employed as a full-time Cleaning Specialist from June 13, 2019 until her employment with FBG Service Corporation ended on July 21, 2020. Claimant worked Monday through Friday from 11:30 a.m. until 8:00 p.m. Claimant's direct supervisor was Tiffany Massey, Site Supervisor.

On September 18, 2019, claimant received a verbal warning for taking an unscheduled break. On June 29, 2020, claimant received a final written warning for taking an unscheduled break after being observed sitting down and talking with employees at the site where she was cleaning. During the five minute conversation, claimant was not observed performing any work.

On July 16, 2020, Massey observed claimant sitting on the floor in the hallway. When Massey asked claimant what she was doing, claimant responded that she was waiting for someone to

get done so that she could continue cleaning. Employer does not know how long claimant had been sitting in the hallway. On July 21, 2020, employer met with claimant about the incident on July 16, 2020. During the meeting, claimant denied sitting in the hallway. On July 21, 2020, employer discharged claimant for taking unscheduled breaks.

REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

For the reasons that follow, the administrative law judge concludes claimant was discharged for disqualifying, job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

Iowa Code section 96.5(2)(a) provides:

An individual shall be *disqualified for benefits*:

2. *Discharge* for misconduct. If the department finds that the individual has been discharged for misconduct in connection with the individual's employment:

a. The disqualification shall continue until the individual has worked in and has been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times the individual's weekly benefit amount, provided the individual is otherwise eligible.

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(1)(a) provides:

a. "Misconduct" is defined as a deliberate act or omission by a worker which constitutes a material breach of the duties and obligations arising out of such worker's contract of employment. Misconduct as the term is used in the disqualification provision as being limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of an employer's interest as is found in deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has the right to expect of employees, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree of recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. On the other hand mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not to be deemed misconduct within the meaning of the statute.

This definition of misconduct has been accepted by the Iowa Supreme Court as accurately reflecting the intent of the legislature. *Reigelsberger v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 500 N.W.2d 64, 66 (Iowa 1993); *accord Lee v. Emp't Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 2000). Further, the employer has the burden of proof in establishing disqualifying job misconduct. *Cosper v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 321 N.W.2d 6 (Iowa 1982).

Iowa Admin. Code r. 871-24.32(8) provides:

(8) *Past acts of misconduct*. While past acts and warnings can be used to determine the magnitude of a current act of misconduct, a discharge cannot be based on such past act or acts. The termination of employment must be based on a current act.

A determination as to whether an employee's act is misconduct does not rest solely on the interpretation or application of the employer's policy or rule. A violation is not necessarily disqualifying misconduct even if the employer was fully within its rights to impose discipline up to or including discharge for the incident under its policy. The issue is not whether the employer made a correct decision in separating claimant, but whether the claimant is entitled to unemployment insurance benefits. *Infante v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 364 N.W.2d 262 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). What constitutes misconduct justifying termination of an employee and what

misconduct warrants denial of unemployment insurance benefits are two separate decisions. *Pierce v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 425 N.W.2d 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1988).

Misconduct serious enough to warrant discharge is not necessarily serious enough to warrant a denial of job insurance benefits. Such misconduct must be "substantial." *Newman v. Iowa Dep't of Job Serv.*, 351 N.W.2d 806 (Iowa Ct. App. 1984). The law limits disqualifying misconduct to substantial and willful wrongdoing or repeated carelessness or negligence that equals willful misconduct in culpability. *Lee v. Employment Appeal Bd.*, 616 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 2000).

When an employee takes an unscheduled break, she is being paid for time during which she did not perform work for employer, which is a deliberate violation or disregard of standards of behavior an employer has the right to expect of its employees. Claimant took an unscheduled break less than a month after receiving a final warning for that same conduct. Claimant's actions constitute disqualifying job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied.

DECISION:

The September 10, 2020 (reference 01) unemployment insurance decision is affirmed. Claimant was discharged for disqualifying job-related misconduct. Benefits are denied until claimant has worked in and been paid wages for insured work equal to ten times claimant's weekly benefit amount, provided claimant is otherwise eligible.



Adrienne C. Williamson
Administrative Law Judge
Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bureau
Iowa Workforce Development
1000 East Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0209
Fax (515)478-3528

March 31, 2021
Decision Dated and Mailed

acw/kmj